

REMARKS

In response to the non-final office action of July 26, 2006, applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the following remarks. Claims 67-80 and 96-143 are currently pending, with claims 67, 105, and 126 being independent. Claims 67, 72, and 73 have been amended; claims 20, 21, 24-28, 30-39, 55-66 and 81-95 have been canceled; and claims 96-143 have been added. In particular, Applicant has amended independent claim 67 to recite "establishing an authenticated connection between a client and an intermediary." Applicant submits that this limitation does not change the scope of the prior version of claim 67 and was included merely to provide explicit antecedent basis for the limitation of "the authenticated connection between the client and the intermediary" included in the last limitation. Additionally, Applicant has amended claim 67 to recite "receiving, from the intermediary, constrained authorization information that has been electronically negotiated by the secured service and the intermediary, the constrained authorization information being electronically negotiated in response to the client request." Support for the amendments and the new claims can be found in the application at, for example, page 10, line 26 through page 11, line 30 referring to Figs. 6 and 7. No new matter has been introduced.

§ 112 Rejection

Claim 72 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response, claim 72 has been amended. The amendment is believed to address all of the Examiner's concerns. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Loucks Rejection

Independent claim 67, along with its dependent claims 68-80, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,481,720 (Loucks). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because claims 20, 21, 24-28, 30-39, 55-

66 and 81-95 have been canceled and Loucks does not describe or suggest all of the limitations recited in amended independent claim 67, as described more fully below.

As amended, independent claim 67 recites a method, performed by a client, of leveraging a connection with an intermediary to access a secured service. An authenticated connection between a client and an intermediary is established and the client receives a user request for access to a secured service. The client submits a request, which is based on the user request for access to a secured service, to the intermediary that is physically distinct of the secured service. The client receives, from the intermediary, constrained authorization information that has been electronically negotiated by the secured service and the intermediary, the constrained authorization information being electronically negotiated in response to the client request. The client submits the constrained authorization information to the secured service to establish a direct authenticated connection between the client and the secured service independent of the authenticated connection between the client and the intermediary.

Loucks does not describe or suggest receiving, from the intermediary, constrained authorization information that has been electronically negotiated by the secured service and the intermediary, the constrained authorization information being electronically negotiated in response to the client request, as recited by claim 67.

Rather, Loucks relates to a flexible method of authenticating an initiating node to a receiving service node in a distributed data processing environment that utilizes separate authentication agent programs at each of the nodes to assist in authentication. See Loucks at col. 6, line 53 through col. 7, line 19. In particular, as shown in Fig. 5, when a requestor process 504 running on an initiating node wishes to establish an authenticated connection with a service process 514 running on a receiving service node, the requestor process 504 sends a message 520 identifying the process making the request and the requested service to a requestor authentication agent program 502 running on the initiating node. See Loucks at col. 8, lines 44-65. The requestor authentication agent program 502 determines authentication information for the requestor process 504 based on the message 520 and sends the authentication information to the requestor process 504 in a reply message 521. See Loucks at col. 8, line 66 through col. 9, line

9. The requestor process 504 then sends the authentication information included in the reply message 521 to the service process 514, so that the service process 514 can send the authentication information to a service authentication agent 512 running on the receiving service node to process the authentication information. See Loucks at col. 9, lines 9-31. Notably, Loucks does not describe or suggest that the authentication information received by the requestor process 504 from the requestor authentication agent program 502 was previously electronically negotiated between an intermediary and the service process 514. Nor does Loucks describe or suggest that this authentication information was electronically negotiated by an intermediary and the service process 514 in response to the message 520. Rather, Loucks describes the authentication information being generated by the requestor authentication agent program 502 without any electronic communication whatsoever between an intermediary and the service process 514. Thus, Loucks fails to describe or suggest receiving, from the intermediary, constrained authorization information that has been electronically negotiated by the secured service and the intermediary, the constrained authorization information being electronically negotiated in response to the client request, as recited by claim 67.

More specifically, in one implementation, Loucks describes that the requestor authentication agent program 502 may communicate with a Kerberos ticket granting service to acquire a ticket to be used as the authentication information for the requestor process 504. See Loucks at col. 11, lines 55-65. In response to the request, the Kerberos ticket granting service generates a ticket without communicating with the service process 514 or with any other entity and sends the ticket to the requestor authentication agent program 502. See Loucks at col. 11, line 66 through col. 12, line 10 and col. 4, line 62 through col. 5, line 30.¹ Because the Kerberos service generates a ticket without communicating with the service process 514 or with any other entity, the requestor authentication agent program 502 does not receive constrained authorization information from the Kerberos service that has been electronically negotiated between the Kerberos service and a secured service. As such, Loucks fails to describe or suggest receiving,

¹ Specifically, Loucks describes that “[a]nother distinctive feature of the Kerberos authentication scheme is that while the user must go to the authentication server to request tickets, the service to which these tickets are being presented does not need to communicate with the Kerberos authentication service during user authentication.” Loucks at col. 5, lines 24-30.

from the intermediary, constrained authorization information that has been electronically negotiated by the secured service and the intermediary, the constrained authorization information being electronically negotiated in response to the client request, as recited by claim 67.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 67 and its dependent claims 68-80.

Applicant also notes that the Examiner responded to points raised in the Appeal Brief filed May 12, 2006 on page 3 of the Office Action. Applicant traverses the statements made by Examiner for at least the reasons presented in the Appeal Brief filed May 12, 2006.

Nevertheless, Applicant submits that neither Cohen, Stevens, Menezes, Sadovsky, nor any proper combination thereof, describes or suggests receiving, from the intermediary, constrained authorization information that has been electronically negotiated by the secured service and the intermediary, the constrained authorization information being electronically negotiated in response to the client request, as recited by amended independent claim 67.

In addition, Applicant notes the Examiner's assertion that the Examiner's use of official with regards to the claimed limitations found in claims 35-37, 55, 56, 66, 73, 79-81, 84, 87-90, and 95 has not been adequately traversed. To the contrary, Applicant submits that the Examiner's use of official notice with regard to claims 35-37, 55, 56, 66, 73, 79-81, 84, 87-90, and 95 was properly traversed in the response to office action filed on August 2, 2005. Therefore, Applicant submits that it is not proper for the Examiner to consider the official notice taken with regard to claims 35-37, 55, 56, 66, 73, 79-81, 84, 87-90, and 95 as admitted prior art.

New independent claim 105 recites electronically negotiating constrained authorization information with the secured service in response to receiving the client request, and new independent claim 126 recites electronically negotiating constrained authorization information with the intermediary in response to receiving the notification. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 67, applicant submits that claims 105 and 126, along with their dependent claims 106-125 and 127-143 are in condition for allowance.

Applicant : Robert Bruce Hirsh
Serial No. : 09/894,919
Filed : June 29, 2001
Page : 18 of 18

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-200001 / Security 13

Conclusion

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.136, Applicant hereby petitions that the period for response to the action dated July 26, 2006, be extended for one month to and including November 26, 2006. November 26, 2006 is a Sunday.

Please charge the fee in the amount of \$320.00 in payment of the one month extension of time fee (\$120) and excess claims fee (\$200) to the deposit account 06-1050. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/27/2006



Jeremy J. Monaldo
Reg. No. 58,680

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331
200001 response.doc